

Quantum mechanics for three versions of the Dirac equation in a curved spacetime

Mayeul Arminjon¹ and Frank Reifler²

¹ *CNRS (Section of Theoretical Physics).*

At Laboratory “Soils, Solids, Structures—Risks,”

CNRS & University of Grenoble, Grenoble, France.

² *Lockheed Martin Corporation,*

Maritime Systems & Sensors,

Moorestown, New Jersey, USA.

1 Quantum Mechanics in a gravitational field

- ▶ Quantum effects in the classical gravitational field *are observed*, e.g. in neutron interferometry [1, 2]. All of the effects observed until now had been previously predicted by using the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation in the Newtonian gravity potential [2, 3, 4], and are still described by this same non-relativistic approximation.
- ▶ However, gravity is currently described by relativistic theories with *curved spacetime*.
- ▶ The usual way to write the wave equations of quantum mechanics (QM) in a curved spacetime is by *covariantization* (this is connected with the *equivalence principle*): at any given event X , the sought-for equation in a curved spacetime should coincide with the flat-spacetime version in coordinates where the connection vanishes at X and $g_{\mu\nu}(X) = \eta_{\mu\nu}$.

- For the Dirac equation with standard (spinor) transformation, this leads to the *standard equation (Dirac-Fock-Weyl or DFW)*, which does not obey the equivalence principle, at least not the *genuine* one [5].
- In a previous work, *two alternative equations* were got by *applying directly the classical-quantum correspondence* [5]. Thus, we have indeed three different a priori inequivalent versions of the Dirac equation in a curved spacetime.

2 Three Dirac equations in a curved space-time

The three gravitational Dirac equations have the same *form*:

$$\gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi = -im\psi, \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma^\mu = \gamma^\mu(X)$ ($\mu = 0, \dots, 3$) is a field of 4×4 complex matrices defined on the spacetime V [endowed with a Lorentzian metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, with inverse matrix ($g^{\mu\nu}$)], such that

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu + \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu = 2g^{\mu\nu} \mathbf{1}_4, \quad \mu, \nu \in \{0, \dots, 3\} \quad (\mathbf{1}_4 \equiv \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1)); \quad (2)$$

and where ψ is a *bispinor* field for the standard, *DFW* equation, but is a **four-vector** field for the two alternative equations [5], based on the *tensor representation of the Dirac field (TRD)* [6, 7];

and where D_μ is a covariant derivative, associated with a specific *connection*: one for each of the three equations.

2.1 Dirac equation with vector wave function

For Dirac's original equation, the wave function is a (bi)*spinor*. This is due to the Dirac matrices γ^μ being assumed Lorentz-invariant. However, a *matrix* usually does *not* remain invariant after a coordinate change.

In **TRD**, the wave function ψ is a (4-) **vector** instead, and the set of the four Dirac matrices γ^μ builds a third-order **tensor**: after a coordinate change,

$$\psi'^\mu = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\sigma} \psi^\sigma, \quad \gamma'^{\mu\rho} \equiv (\gamma'^\mu)^\rho{}_\nu = \frac{\partial x'^\mu}{\partial x^\sigma} \frac{\partial x'^\rho}{\partial x^\tau} \frac{\partial x^\chi}{\partial x'^\nu} \gamma_\chi^{\sigma\tau}. \quad (3)$$

This too leaves the *usual* Dirac equation covariant [6]. Moreover, the associated QM predictions in a flat spacetime are left **unchanged**, for:

1) *The explicit (coordinate) expression of the Dirac equation is the same as with the standard (spinor) transformation behaviour, and*

2) *There is no influence of the possible set of Dirac matrices [7].*

2.2 The three different connections

- For the two alternative equations (TRD), this is an affine connection:

$$(D_\mu \psi)^\nu \equiv \partial_\mu \psi^\nu + \Delta_{\rho\mu}^\nu \psi^\rho. \quad (4)$$

- For one of the two TRD equations (TRD-1), this is the Levi-Civita connection. I.e., $\Delta_{\rho\mu}^\nu = \{\nu_{\rho\mu}\}$, the Christoffel symbols associated with the spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. The corresponding gravitational Dirac equation *obeys the equivalence principle* [5].
- For TRD-2, the connection Δ is defined from the *spatial* Levi-Civita connection in an assumed *preferred reference frame* [5].
- For the standard equation (DFW), one uses the “spin connection”, which *depends on the γ^μ matrices* and is generally complex [8].

3 A common tool: the hermitizing matrices

For TRD, the set (γ^μ) builds a tensor, hence *cannot be fixed*. This is true even for the “flat” matrices $\gamma^{\sharp\alpha}$ if one defines

$$\gamma^\mu = a^\mu{}_\alpha \gamma^{\sharp\alpha} \quad (5)$$

with a^μ_α an orthonormal tetrad. We must be able to use *any* possible set (γ^μ) of Dirac matrices. Note that, also for DFW, in which the gamma matrices are always defined through a tetrad by Eq. (5), one should study the influence of the choice of the “flat” matrices $\gamma^{\sharp\alpha}$ and the tetrad a^μ_α .

The solution is to use the *hermitizing matrix*: this is a 4×4 matrix A such that

$$A^\dagger = A, \quad (A\gamma^\mu)^\dagger = A\gamma^\mu \quad \mu = 0, \dots, 3, \quad (6)$$

where $M^\dagger \equiv M^{*T}$ = Hermitian conjugate of matrix M . For the usual sets $(\gamma^{\sharp\alpha})$ (Dirac’s, “chiral”, Majorana), $A = \gamma^{\sharp 0}$.

The matrix A , introduced by Bargmann, was studied mainly by Pauli [9]. The existence of A (and B : for the α^μ matrices) has been proved by us for any set (γ^μ) in a general metric [7].

4 Definition of the probability current

In a flat spacetime, the current is unambiguously defined as

$$J^\mu = \psi^\dagger A \gamma^\mu \psi. \quad (7)$$

The definition (7) is generally-covariant, the current being indeed a *four-vector*, for TRD and for DFW as well. Thus it holds true in a curved spacetime $\mathbf{V}$. (Then γ^μ , A depend on $X \in \mathbf{V}$.)

The current (7) is *independent of the choice of the Dirac matrices*: if one changes one set (γ^μ) for another one $(\tilde{\gamma}^\mu)$, the second set can be obtained from the first one by a point-dependent *similarity transformation*:

$$\exists S = S(X) \in \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{C}) : \quad \tilde{\gamma}^\mu(X) = S\gamma^\mu(X)S^{-1}, \quad \mu = 0, \dots, 3, \quad (8)$$

With the change $\tilde{\psi} = S\psi$, this leaves the current unchanged [7, 10].

5 Condition for current conservation

This is specified by the following result [10]:

Theorem 1. *Consider the general Dirac equation in a curved spacetime (1), thus either DFW or any of the two TRD equations. In order that any ψ solution of (1) satisfy the current conservation*

$$D_\mu J^\mu = 0, \quad (9)$$

it is necessary and sufficient that

$$D_\mu(A\gamma^\mu) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Corollary 1. *For DFW theory, the hermitizing matrix field $A(X)$ can be imposed to be the constant matrix $A^\sharp$, i.e., a hermitizing matrix for the “flat” matrices $\gamma^{\sharp\alpha}$ of Eq. (5). Then the current conservation applies to any solution of the DFW equation.*

6 Admissible coefficient fields

Theorem 1 means that not all possible coefficient fields (γ^μ, A) of the Dirac equation are physically admissible, but merely the ones which, in addition to the anticommutation relation (2), satisfy the field equation (10) ensuring current conservation. Such systems we call “*admissible*.”

Example: in a *flat* spacetime, relevant fields γ^μ are ones which are *constant in Cartesian coordinates* (and hence also the field A). Then the condition for current conservation (10) is satisfied.

If one selects the gamma field [satisfying (2)] “at random,” the condition (10) and the current conservation do not generally apply to the solutions of the Dirac equation (1) *even in a flat spacetime—except for DFW*.

7 The Hamiltonian is frame-dependent

The Dirac equation (1) can be put into Schrödinger form:

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = H\psi, \quad (t \equiv x^0), \quad (11)$$

with

$$\mathbf{H} \equiv m\alpha^0 - i\alpha^j D_j - i(D_0 - \partial_0), \quad (12)$$

where

$$\alpha^0 \equiv \gamma^0/g^{00}, \quad \alpha^j \equiv \gamma^0\gamma^j/g^{00}. \quad (13)$$

In order that the Hamiltonians $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{H}'$ before and after a coordinate change be equivalent operators, the coordinate change must be a **spatial** change:

$$x'^0 = x^0, \quad x'^j = f^j((x^k)). \quad (14)$$

Then, both sides of the Schrödinger equation (11) behave as a scalar for DFW, and as a vector for TRD. Thus **$\mathbf{H}$ depends on the reference frame**, i.e., on the three-dimensional congruence of world lines (observers) which is considered. This frame dependence of the Hamiltonian and the resulting necessity of restricting oneself to spatial coordinate changes is a general result that holds true for other wave equations. In Ref. [10], we give a precise definition of a *reference frame* in this context, and we study it mathematically.

8 Hermiticity condition for the Hamiltonian

The Hilbert scalar product is fixed by the following result [10]:

Theorem 5. *A necessary condition for the scalar product of time-independent wave functions to be time independent and for the Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H}$ to be a Hermitian operator, is that the scalar product should be*

$$(\psi | \varphi) \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R}^3} \psi^\dagger A \gamma^0 \varphi \sqrt{-g} \, d^3\mathbf{x}. \quad (15)$$

The hermiticity condition for the Hamiltonian, w.r.t. this scalar product, is then given by [10]:

Theorem 6. *Assume that the coefficient fields (γ^μ, A) satisfy the two admissibility conditions (2) and (10). In order that the Dirac Hamiltonian (12) be Hermitian for the scalar product (15), it is necessary and sufficient that*

$$\partial_0 (\sqrt{-g} A \gamma^0) = 0. \quad (16)$$

9 For DFW, hermiticity is not stable under a local similarity transformation

For DFW, *all* local similarity transformations are admissible, since condition (10) is always satisfied [with the choice $A(X) \equiv A^\sharp$: see Corollary 1]. In contrast, for TRD, condition (10) is quite demanding.

For DFW, in very general coordinates, the tetrad (a^μ_α) may be chosen to satisfy $a^0_j = 0$. Taking for “flat” matrices the standard Dirac matrices $\gamma^\sharp{}^\alpha$, the hermiticity condition (16) then reduces to Leclerc’s [11] :

$$\partial_0(\sqrt{-g} g^{00}) = 0. \quad (17)$$

But, after a local similarity S , the condition (16) becomes

$$\partial_0(\sqrt{-g} g^{00} S^\dagger S) = 0, \quad (18)$$

which obviously *cannot* be satisfied if (17) is, and if moreover $S^\dagger S = F(t)$.

10 Conclusion

- ▶ *Two* new gravitational Dirac equations were previously derived from wave mechanics [5]. One obeys the equivalence principle, the other one has a preferred reference frame. Both see the wave function as a *vector*. This leaves QM associated with the Dirac equation of special relativity unchanged, i.e., for Minkowski spacetime in Cartesian coordinates [7].
- ▶ The three gravitational Dirac equations have been studied in a common framework, using the hermitizing matrix (field) A [10]:
 - The current conservation asks for the matrix equation $D_\mu(A\gamma^\mu) = 0$. Thus, not all coefficient fields of the Dirac equation are admissible.
 - The hermiticity condition is $\partial_0(\sqrt{-g} A\gamma^0) = 0$. This is frame dependent, as is natural indeed. We gave a formal definition of a reference frame.

- For DFW, this condition is not stable under admissible similarity transformations: the standard version of the gravitational Dirac equation seems to have a uniqueness problem. We are currently pursuing the study to clarify this.

References

- [1] Colella, R., Overhauser, A. W., Werner, S. A.: Observation of gravitationally induced quantum interference. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1472–1474 (1975).
- [2] Werner, S. A., Staudenmann, J. A., Colella, R.: Effect of Earth’s rotation on the quantum mechanical phase of the neutron. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1103–1107 (1979).
- [3] Overhauser, A. W., Colella, R.: Experimental test of gravitationally induced quantum interference. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 1237–1240 (1974).
- [4] Luschikov, V. I., Frank, A. I.: Quantum effects occurring when ultracold neutrons are stored on a plane. *JETP Lett.* **28**, 559–561 (1978).
- [5] Arminjon, M.: Two alternative Dirac equations with gravitation. arXiv:gr-qc/0702048 (2007).
- [6] Arminjon, M.: Dirac equation from the Hamiltonian and the case with a gravitational field. *Found. Phys. Lett.* **19**, 225–247 (2006). [arXiv:gr-qc/0512046]
- [7] Arminjon, M., Reifler, F.: Dirac equation: Representation independence and tensor transformation. *Braz. J. Phys.* **38**, 248–258 (2008). [arXiv:0707.1829 (quant-ph)]
- [8] Brill, D. R., Wheeler, J. A.: Interaction of neutrinos and gravitational fields. *Rev. Modern Phys.* **29**, 465–479 (1957). Erratum: *Rev. Modern Phys.* **33**, 623–624 (1961).
- [9] Pauli, W.: Über die Formulierung der Naturgesetze mit fünf homogenen Koordinaten, Teil II: Die Diracschen Gleichungen für die Materiewellen. *Ann. der Phys.* (5) **18**, 337–354 (1933).
- [10] Arminjon, M., Reifler, F.: Basic quantum mechanics for three Dirac equations in a curved spacetime. arXiv:0807.0570 (gr-qc)
- [11] Leclerc, M.: Hermitian Dirac Hamiltonian in the time-dependent gravitational field. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23**, 4013–4020 (2006). [arXiv:gr-qc/0511060]